



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,829	12/22/2005	Vivekanand Pai Kochikar	2639	3949
7617 7590 05/28/2009 BRUZGA & ASSOCIATES 11 BROADWAY, SUITE 715 NEW YORK, NY 10004				
EXAMINER				
BORISSOV, IGOR N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/551,829

Applicant(s)

KOCHIKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Igor N. Borissov

Art Unit

3628

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 10, 13-16, 18, 38, 59, 77-84, 87-95 and 98-103 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 10, 13, 14-16, 18, 77-82, 103, 38, 83, 84, 87-93, 59, 94, 95, 98-102 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-848)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendment received on 01/15/2009 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 13, 14-16, 18, 77-82, 103, 38, 83, 84, 87-93, 59, 94, 95, 98-102 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 13, 14-16, 18, 77-82, 103, 38, 83, 84, 87-93, 59, 94, 95, 98-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginn (US 6,275,811 B1).

Ginn teaches a computer-implemented method and system for knowledge management, comprising:

Claims 1, 38 and 59,

admitting a member into a community or sub-community (based on interest to be in said community or sub-community) (C. 1, L. 11-16; C. 4, L. 62-67);

storing knowledge assets in a repository, preferably in a computer- readable format (C. 4, L. 62-67);

cataloguing of knowledge assets before publication for easy retrieval by classifying them against a multi-dimensional knowledge hierarchy (C. 5, L. 1-6);

receiving new knowledge assets from members of the community (C. 4, L. 62-67);

validating, reviewing and rating of the new knowledge assets by assigned members of the community (C. 5, L. 38-30, 43-45; C. 6, L. 25-67);

storing and publishing the validated knowledge in the repository (C. 5, L. 38-30, 43-45; C. 6, L. 25-67);

reviewing and rating of published knowledge assets by any member of the community (C. 7, L. 5-10);

calculating a composite rating for knowledge assets based on an aggregation of ratings and usage over time of the knowledge assets in the community (C. 8, L. 1-42);

calculating an aggregate rating for a member in each community based on the contributions of the member to the community (C. 8, L. 1-42);

calculating an aggregate rating for each community based on the ratings of all its members (C. 8, L. 1-42);

calculating and displaying on a scoreboard, various ratings for members and communities (groups or users) (Abstract).

Ginn does not explicitly teach that said displaying step includes displaying various ratings for sub-communities. However, method steps disclosed in Ginn are equally applicable for any type of groups of users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ginn to include that said displaying step includes displaying various ratings for sub-communities, because it would advantageously allow to accommodate needs of various groups of interests.

Claims 2, 4, 10, 13, 14-16, 18, 77-82, 103, 83, 84, 87-93, 94, 95, 98-102, are rejected on the same rationale as claims 1, 38 and 59. Furthermore, the use of statistical tools for data manipulation is well known in the art for the benefit of time saving and achieving accurate results.

Claims 6, 8, 9, 85, 86, 96 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginn in view of Gilmour (US 6,970,879 B1).

As per claims 6, 8, 9, 85, 86, 96 and 97, Ginn teaches all the limitations of claims 6, 8, 9, 85, 86, 96 and 97, except that said selection of said one or more reviewers is

conducted by matching the knowledge nodes and paths of the asset with those of the expert profiles of members in the community.

Gilmour teaches a method and system for knowledge management, wherein when a user requests an expert in a certain field, the knowledge access server matches the term against both the public and private portions of all user profiles (C. 10, L. 24-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ginn to include that said selection of said one or more reviewers is conducted by matching the knowledge nodes and paths of the asset with those of the expert profiles of members in the community, as disclosed in Gilmour, because it would advantageously allow to provide the most accurate response to the request.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Ginn's knowledge assets are far more restricted in type than is possible with the presently claimed knowledge assets, and that the presently claimed invention allows for far more intricate collaboration among the members than is possible with Ginn's method, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies in claims 1, 38 and 59, is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that Ginn fails to teach or suggest the member admission as recited in Claims 1, 38 and 59, it is noted that Ginn explicitly

teaches discussion or news groups where users exchange information between each other within said groups (C. 1, L. 11-16).

In response to applicant's argument that Ginn fails to teach or suggest "calculating an aggregate rating for a member in each community based on the contributions of the member to the community", it is noted that Ginn does, in fact, teaches said feature (C. 8, L. 1-42). As per Applicant's argument that rating in Ginn is different than that of the invention, it is noted that claims as currently amended allow broad understanding of the recited features, and do not exclude Ginn's teaching.

Same reasoning applied to composite rating for knowledge assets.

The remaining Applicant's arguments in respect to composite rating for knowledge assets and cataloguing of knowledge assets essentially repeat the arguments presented above; therefore, the responses presented by the examiner above are equally applicable to the remaining applicant's arguments.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Igor Borissov whose telephone number is 571-272-6801. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Igor N. Borissov/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628

05/26/2009